

REMARKS

With the entry of the foregoing amendments, the application contains claims 1-14. Favorable consideration is requested.

Claim 1 has simply been amended to move the exact same structural language from the alleged preamble to the body of the claim. Claim 13 has been similarly amended. No new matter has been added, and these changes do not merit a new search because all of these structural features were in the claims as previously presented. Moreover, the amendments should be entered at this time because they place the claims in condition for allowance as discussed below and in the concurrently submitted Rule 132 Declaration.

The concurrently submitted Rule 132 Declaration should also be entered because it simply states the facts in declaration form that the applicant has submitted by way of its previously filed responses. In addition, the Rule 132 Declaration places the application in condition for allowance – similar to applicant's other application that the Examiner recently passed to allowance.

In response to:

- (a) the rejection of claims 1-2, 4-9 and 11-12 as allegedly anticipated by Kudert,
- (b) the rejection of claims 3 and 10 as allegedly being obvious over Kudert, and
- (c) the rejection of claims 13-14 as allegedly being obvious over Van

Schaftingen,

applicant respectfully traverses the rejections in view of the detailed facts and positions set forth in the concurrently filed Rule 132 Declaration. To minimize the Examiner's

reading, applicant incorporates those detailed facts and positions by reference here and invites the Examiner to read and consider the facts and positions set forth in the Rule 132 Declaration of Dr. Jacques Thomasset dated February 6, 2009.

In this regard, amended claim 1 requires:

a multilayer dose comprising
a first synthetic resin, and
at least one layer of functional resin imprisoned at least largely in said
resin,
wherein a part of its surface is concave, and
wherein the multilayer dose is in the melt state and has an axis of
symmetry for the realization of multilayer objects by compression.

The prior art does not disclose the claimed multilayer dose with the substantive structural features of:

a first synthetic resin, and
at least one layer of functional resin imprisoned at least largely in said
resin,
wherein a part of its surface is concave, and
wherein the multilayer dose is in the melt state and has an axis of
symmetry for the realization of multilayer objects by compression.

Moreover, as factually stated in paragraphs 7-8 of the Rule 132 Declaration, the claimed multilayer dose that is in the melt state is structurally different than a molded part like a parison that is solid or any perform disclosed in Kudert. Thus, Kudert's

disclosure does not anticipate the multilayer dose of claim 1 or any claim depending thereon. Also, for the reasons and facts set forth in the Rule 132 Declaration, Kudert does not render obvious dependent claims 3 and 10.

Nor does Van Schaftingen render obvious claims 13-14. As set forth in detail in paragraphs 9-10 of the Rule 132 Declaration, Van Schaftingen fails to disclose or suggest the specific process of claim 13 and the specific product of claim 14. Indeed, the cited reference does not include any drawings and discloses entirely different devices and processes. In view of the facts and positions set forth in the concurrently filed Rule 132 Declaration, applicant requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 13 and 14 based on Van Schaftingen.

Applicant submits that this application is in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner has any questions or believes that minor claim amendments would assist with the allowance of this case, the undersigned may be contacted at 703-816-4009.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYTE P.C.

By: /Duane M. Byers/

Duane M. Byers
Reg. No. 33,363

DMB:lmo

901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100